Case No. 3:23-cv-01098-AGT

DECLARATION OF STUART G. GROSS IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO (1) JONATHAN MARK'S **MOTION TO QUASH** SUBPOENA TO VERIZON **WIRELESS (DKT. 458); (2)** JEROD GOODIN'S MOTION TO **QUASH SUBPOENA TO** VERIZON WIRELESS (DKT. 475); AND (3) JONATHAN MARK AND JEROD GOODIN'S MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA TO AT&T INC. (DKT. 476)

December 19, 2025 Date:

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Judge: Honorable Alex G. Tse

Courtroom: A, 15th Floor

REDACTED VERSION OF **DOCUMENTS SOUGHT TO BE** FILED UNDER SEAL

1

GROSS KLEIN PC THE EMBARCADERO PIER 9, SUITE 100 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

28

DECLARATION OF STUART G. GROSS IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO JONATHAN MARK AND JEROD GOODIN'S MOTIONS TO QUASH; Case No. 3:23-cv-01098-AGT

GLOBAL QUALITY FOODS, INC.; GLOBAL QUALITY SEAFOOD LLC; OCEAN KING

FISH INC.; BORNSTEIN SEAFOODS, INC.; ASTORIA PACIFIC SEAFOODS, LLC; DA YANG SEAFOOD INC.; GREAT OCEAN SEAFOOD INC.; and DOES 32-60,

Defendants.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

I, Stuart G. Gross, declare as

- 1. I am a principal at Gross Klein PC and counsel for Plaintiffs. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Opposition To (1) Jonathan Mark's Motion To Quash Subpoena To Verizon Wireless (Dkt. 458); (2) Jerod Goodin's Motion To Quash Subpoena To Verizon Wireless (Dkt. 475); And (3) Jonathan Mark And Jerod Goodin's Motion To Quash Subpoena To At&T Inc. (Dkt. 476) ("Motions to Quash"). If called as a witness, I could and would truthfully testify to the following based on my personal knowledge.
- 2. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of an email thread between Theresa H. Rava, counsel for Jonathan Mark and Jerod Goodin, and Stuart G. Gross and Raymond S. Levine, counsel for Plaintiffs, reflecting attempts to resolve Dkts. 458, 475, and 476 without motion practice, and agreements reached during the intervening meet and confers.
- 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of a stipulation reached with counsel for Don Alber, resolving similar concerns to those raised in Dkts. 458, 475, and 476, which were a basis of meet and confers between counsel for Jonathan Mark and Jerod Goodin and Plaintiffs' Counsel.
- 4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' amended subpoena served on Verizon Wireless on August 22, 2025.
- 5. Attached hereto as Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' subpoena served on AT&T Inc. on August 6, 2025.
- 6. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 5** is a true and correct copy of documents bearing the Bates Range CSF 000782-83, an extract of text messages between
- 7. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 6** is a true and correct copy of documents bearing the Baes Range FATHOM 0008022-23, an extract of text messages between
- 8. Attached hereto as **Exhibit** 7 is a true and correct copy of documents bearing the Baes Range FATHOM 0008579-82, an extract of text messages between

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

9. I have conferred with counsel for Verizon Wireless and AT&T Inc. Counsel for
Verizon Wireless and AT&T Inc. represented that the records each carrier would produce will
contain only the date of communications, the time of communications, and the phone numbers
involved in each communication.

10. Plaintiffs' counsel and counsel for Mark and Goodin conferred telephonically several times on November 3 and 4, 2025 regarding this motion to quash. In the course of meeting and conferring, Plaintiffs' counsel and counsel for Jonathan Mark and Jerod Goodin agreed on a process of production. Verizon Wireless and AT&T Inc. would first produce the subpoenaed records to counsel for Jonathan Mark and Jerod Goodin. Counsel could then review and redact the production for privilege and relevance, provided that counsel enumerated which portions were to be redacted, and the basis for the redactions based on privilege or relevance. Counsel also agreed that the production would be presumptively designated "highly confidential" under the stipulated protective order effective in this case. See Dkt. 63. The sole point of disagreement is the timeframe of productions from Verizon Wireless and AT&T Inc.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on November 19, 2025.

By: /s/ Stuart G. Gross STUART G. GROSS

24 25

26

27 28